

*Request for Continued Examination
U.S. Ser. No. 10/249,205
Page 7 of 10*

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Entry of the current amendment and allowance as currently amended is respectfully requested. Over the course of three telephone interviews with Primary Examiner Correlius between June 16 and June 20, 2005, Applicant proposed the attached amendments to the claim language to overcome Examiner Truong's rejections and place the application in condition for allowance. The attached amendment does not add new matter and is for clarification of the registration process only.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections

Examiner Truong's rejections in the September 13, 1004 Final Office Action ("FOA") were based on U.S. Patent 6,144,959 to Anderson ("Anderson") in view of U.S. Patent 6,269,369 to Robertson ("Robertson") or U.S. Patent 5,664,109 to Johnson ("Johnson").

Regarding Claim 1, Applicant clarified the "without registration" limitation to be "without express registration action in the web-based database". Examiner Truong readily admitted that Anderson does not teach all the limitations of Claim 1. Office Action dated September 13, 2004 at 2-3 and 16. Additionally, Anderson's system for managing user accounts only updates the local access database upon the user logging in to a workstation. [col. 4, lines 60-67]. Furthermore, neither Robertson nor Johnson bridges the gap between Applicant's

Request for Continued Examination

U.S. Ser. No. 10/249,205

Page 8 of 10

invention and Anderson. Robertson discloses a personal contact manager. The personal contact manager has a “database 340 that contains contact information entered by registered users.” [col. 4, lines 41-42]. The personal contact manager of Robertson requires express registration action in the database. In contrast to Robertson, Applicant specifically claims “without express registration action”. As such, the combination of Anderson and Robertson fails to teach all limitations of Claim 1. The obviousness rejection of Claim 1 and the claims that depend therefrom based on Anderson in view of Robertson is therefore improper.

Likewise, Anderson in view of Johnson does not disclose each element of Claim 1. Johnson ‘109 describes a medical network of computer servers wherein the server computers “store medical record documents and data for each [registered] patient of each subscribing [registered] provider.” [col. 4, lines 54-55]. The invention described by Johnson requires that any records are from an individual that has previously registered for storing their record. For example, a patient registers with a medical service provider that has already registered with the entity providing the medical record storage services. This involves at least two distinct registration steps in order to store the medical information. Johnson further emphasizes the registration requirement in disclosing a “database is automatically populated using information extracted from certain documents such as an admission or **registration** document” [col. 3, lines 18-20] and describing the use

Request for Continued Examination
U.S. Ser. No. 10/249,265
Page 9 of 10

of "registration documents" for "new patients" [col. 12, lines 44-45]. The medical record database taught by Johnson specifically requires registration action by the individuals and thus teaches away from Applicant's invention.

Regarding Claim 17, Applicant amended to clarify the registration process. Claim 17 now recites that the database is populated "without the customer accessing said database" and further discloses distributing the access numbers "without a customer request". Neither Anderson in view of Robertson nor Anderson in view of Johnson teaches each element of amended Claim 17. Anderson's system for managing user accounts only updates the local access database upon the user logging in to a workstation. [col. 4, lines 60-67]. Robertson's personal contact manager requires the users to register before sharing information. Johnson's medical records database requires the user register prior to having medical records stored. Each of these registration steps require accessing the database and thus teaches away from Applicant's invention.

Conclusion

During the course of these remarks, Applicant has at times referred to particular limitations of the claims that are not shown in the applied prior art. This shorthand approach to discussing the claims should not be construed to mean that the other claimed limitations are not part of the claimed invention. Consequently, when interpreting the claims, each of the claims should be construed as a whole,

Request for Continued Examination
U.S. Ser. No. 10/249,205
Page 10 of 10

and patentability determined in light of this required claim construction. Unless Applicant has specifically stated that an amendment was made to distinguish the prior art, it was the intent of the amendment to further clarify and better define the claimed invention.

If the Examiner has any questions or comments regarding this communication, he is invited to contact the undersigned directly to expedite the resolution of this application. Entry of this Amendment and allowance of the amended claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,


David B. Dickinson
David B. Dickinson
Patent Reg. No. 47,525
Lundeen & Dickinson LLP
PO Box 131144
Houston, Texas 77219
(713) 652-2555 Telephone
(713) 652-2556 Facsimile

Page 10 of 10